

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/831,209	05/07/2001	Derek Ness	UDL0155PUSA	UDL0155PUSA 1349	
22045 . 75	590 07/28/2003				
BROOKS & KUSHMAN 1000 TOWN CENTER 22ND FL			EXAMINER		
SOUTHFIELD, MI 48075		•	BOYD, JEN	NIFER A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1771	/0	
		DA	DATE MAILED: 07/28/2003	, 0	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		FILE	_ A-S
·	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Cummons	09/831,209	NESS ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit	
TI MAN INO DATE COL	Jennifer A Boyd	1771	- <u> </u>
Th MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply if NO period for reply specified above, the maximum statutory period with Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, and the complex received by the Office later than three months after the mailing of earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communicat	ion.
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 M	lay 2003 .		
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ This	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	nce except for formal matters, pr Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	osecution as to the merits 53 O.G. 213.	s is
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 – 4, 6 – 18 and 20 – 23</u> is/are pendi			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	n from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6) Claim(s) $1 - 4$, $6 - 18$ and $20 - 23$ is/are rejected.	ed.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers	election requirement.		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		•	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted		min na	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on i			
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply		ved by the Examiner.	
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exar			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign μ	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f)	
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	(4) 6. (1).	
1. Certified copies of the priority documents I	have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents I		on No.	
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of 	y documents have been received	d in this National Stage	
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic			ion)
a) The translation of the foreign language provides 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	sional application has been rece	eived.	ionj.
Attachment(s)	phoney under 55 G.S.C. 33 120	anu/01 121.	
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal Pa	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) atent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 1771

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

- 1. The Applicant's Amendments and Accompanying Remarks, filed May 6, 2003, have been entered as Paper No. 9 and have been carefully considered. The Specification has been amended. Claims 1 4, 7, 8, 14 and 17 have been amended, claims 5 and 19 have been cancelled, claims 22 and 23 have been added and claims 1 4, 6 18 and 20 23 are pending. Due to Applicant's amendment of the Specification, the Examiner withdraws the 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph rejection of claims 1 14 and 16 21 as set forth in paragraphs 3 4 of Paper No. 7. Despite these advances, the invention as currently claimed is not found to be patentable for reasons herein below.
- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 3. Claims 1 4, 6 8, 10 12, 14, 16 18, 20 21 and 23 are rejected under 35

 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Narita et al. (US 5,431,995). The rejection is maintained.

 The details of the rejection can be found in paragraph 6 of Paper No. 7.
- 4. As to the amendment of claim 1, Narita teaches that the compound is laminated and due to the pressure, the cloth layers will be partly compacted into the resin layer (column 3, lines 25 40), which would result in the Applicant's "partially unimpregnated" fibrous layer. It should be noted that the limitation "allows trapped air to pass out of the material during processing" is

Art Unit: 1771

considered a process limitation, therefore, it is not given any patentable weight because it does not have any impact on the final product. Narita teaches that the fibrous layers can be woven or non-woven fabric (column 2, lines 15 – 20) and can be partially compacted into the resin layer (column 3, lines 25 – 40), which meets the physical limitation set forth by Narita. It should be noted that an element is "adapted to" perform a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. The phrase "adapted for use in multiple layers" does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense. *In re Hutchison*, 69 USPQ 138.

- 5. As to claim 23, Narita teaches that the laminate is molded under pressure (column 3, lines 35 40), therefore, it should be relatively free of voids.
- 6. Claims 1 2 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Letterman (US 4,622,091).

Letterman is directed to a resin film infusion process (Title). Letterman teaches a monolithic structure formed of woven, knitted, or mats integrally supported and bonded by a cured resin (column 2, lines 29 - 35). Letterman teaches that a plurality of dry fiber plies are layered to create a dry preform (column 2, lines 34 - 36). Letterman teaches that the preform may be in two or more pieces separated by a layer of resin (column 2, lines 49 - 52).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. Claims 9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narita et al. (US 5,431,995) in view of De Jager (US 5,439,627). The rejection is maintained. The details of the rejection can be found in paragraph 8 of Paper No. 7.

Application/Control Number: 09/831,209

Art Unit: 1771

Response to Arguments

Page 4

- 8. Applicant's arguments filed May 6, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 9. In response to Applicant's argument that Narita does not disclose all the limitation of the Applicant, the Examiner respectfully argues the contrary. The use of the limitation "adapted for use in multiple layers" does not provide a positive limitation because it only requires the laminate to have the ability to do so. The phrase is not given any patentable weight. Additionally, the Applicant states that Narita does not teach that the fibrous layer "allows entrapped air to pass out of the material during processing". Narita sets forth the physical limitations of the fibrous layer by requiring that the layer is a woven or non-woven fabric (column 2, lines 15 20) and can be partially compacted into the resin layer (column 3, lines 25 40). The limitation of allowing entrapped air to pass out of the material during processing is a process limitation and is not given any patentable weight in a claim directed to an article.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 1771

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer A Boyd whose telephone number is 703-305-7082. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday (8:30am - 6:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on 703-308-2414. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Mla Kuddock

Jennifer Boyd

July 17, 2003